UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/665,929	09/17/2003	Nischal Abrol	030142	6825

23696 7590 07/03/2008

QUALCOMM INCORPORATED
5775 MOREHOUSE DR.
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121

EXAMINER	
KARIKARI, KWASI	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2617	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/03/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

us-docketing@qualcomm.com
kascanla@qualcomm.com
nanm@qualcomm.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/665,929	ABROL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KWASI KARIKARI	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 April 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-7,9-15,20,22,23,25,28 and 29* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *2-3,16-19,21,26-27 and 30-33* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-7,9-15,20,22,23,25,28 and 29* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, filed on 064/28/2008 with respect to claims *1, 4-7, 9-15, 20, 22, 23, 25, 28 and 29* in the remarks, have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated by the new limitations added to claims. See the rejection below of claims *1, 4-7,9-15, 20, 22, 23, 25, 28 and 29* for relevant citations found in Bertrand disclosing the newly added limitations.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 4-6, 20, 22 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madour (US 20030053431 A1), (hereinafter Madour) in view of Bertrand et al. (U.S 6,876,640), (hereinafter Bertrand).

Regarding claims 1 and 20, Madour discloses a wireless communication device (= terminal 205, see Fig. 2) comprising:

a connection table for storing one or more connection identifiers, wherein a connection identifier corresponds to a Packet Coordination Function (PCF) that has been previously visited by the wireless communication device (= terminal stores PZID of visited PZ, see Pars. 0005, 0008, 0028-29 and 0031-32);

a receiver for receiving a connection identifier (see Pars. 0032 and 0034);

a processor for delivering the received connection identifier to the connection table for storing when the received connection identifier is not contained in the connection table (see Pars. 0032 and 0034); and

a transmitter for sending a registration in response to the received connection identifier when the received connection identifier is not contained in the connection table (see Pars. 0006-10, 0028-29, 0033-35 and 0037); but fails to disclose "a timer, wherein the processor removes a connection from the connection table in response to an expiration of the timer".

However, Bertrand which is an analogous art discloses "a timer, wherein the processor removes a connection from the connection table in response to an expiration of the timer" (see col. 9, lines 1-38).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Bertrand with the system of Madour for the benefit of achieving a system that reduces radio resource by preventing the creation and renegotiation of PPP session whenever mobile station moves different PDSN (see Bertrand, col. 3, lines 20-30).

Regarding **claim 4,** as recited in claim 3, Madour fails to disclose the wireless communication device wherein, wherein the processor resets the timer in response to transmission by the transmitter on the connection associated therewith.

However, Bertrand which is an analogous art discloses "wherein the processor resets the timer in response to transmission by the transmitter on the connection associated therewith (see col. 9, lines 1-38).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Bertrand with the system of Madour for the benefit of achieving a system that reduces radio resource by preventing the creation and renegotiation of PPP session whenever mobile station moves different PDSN (see Bertrand, col. 3, lines 20-30).

Regarding **claim 5,** as recited in claim 3, Madour further discloses the wireless communication device wherein, the processor clears the connection table when a connection is received corresponding to a Packet Data Serving Node (PDSN) that is different from a PDSN corresponding to a previously stored connection (see Pars. 0032,

0034 and 0037).

Regarding **claim 6,** as recited in claim 3, Madour further discloses the wireless communication device wherein, the processor clears the connection table when a clear table message is received by the receiver (see Pars. 0032, 0034 and 0037).

Regarding **claim 22,** as recited in claim 20, Madour further discloses the method further comprising: receiving a clear table message; and clearing the connection table in response to the clear table message (see Pars. 0032, 0034 and 0037).

Regarding **claim 28,** Madour discloses an apparatus, comprising:

means for receiving a connection identifier (see Pars. 0032 and 0034);

means for storing the received connection identifier in a connection table when the connection is not contained in the connection table (= terminal stores PZID of visited PZ, see Pars. 0005, 0008, 0028-29 and 0031-32); and

means for registering a connection in response to a received connection not contained in the connection table (see Pars. 0006-10, 0028-29, 0033-35 and 0037); but fails to disclose "a timer, wherein the processor removes a connection from the connection table in response to an expiration of the timer".

However, Bertrand which is an analogous art discloses "a timer, wherein the processor removes a connection from the connection table in response to an expiration of the timer" (see col. 9, lines 1-38).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Bertrand with the system of Madour for the benefit of achieving a system that reduces radio resource by preventing the creation and renegotiation of PPP session whenever mobile station moves different PDSN (see Bertrand, col. 3, lines 20-30).

3. **Claims 7,9-15, 23, 25 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertrand in view of Madour (US 6,834,050 A1), (hereinafter Madour II).**

Regarding **claims 7, 23** and **29,** Bertrand discloses a Packet Data Serving Node (PDSN) /method, operable with a plurality of PCFs (RN 108) via a corresponding plurality of connections (112), each PCF operable to communicate with one or more wireless communication devices (102), the PDSN further operable with a network (118) for directing data for transmission to one or more wireless communication devices (see Fig. 1), comprising:

a connection table for storing a plurality of connection sets (= PPP register 126 could be located any where in system 100, see col. 5, lines 50-67 and col. 6, lines 10-20), each connection set comprising one or more connections associated with a wireless communication device (= R-P interface and PPP connection, see Fig. 1);

a processor (= inherent feature of RN 108) for selecting a connection from the one or more connections in a connection set associated with a wireless

communication device for which data is directed from the network (= complete negotiation of PPP context of PPP session, see col. 1, lines 65-66 and col. 8, lines 12-59); and

a buffer for receiving data from the network that is designated for delivery to a wireless communication device, storing the received data until the wireless communication device is located on one of the connections in the connection set and transmitting the stored data on the selected connection to the wireless communication device (see col. 1, line 65-67; col. 2, lines 49- col. 3, line 43); but fails to teach wherein a first timer in the PDSN and a second timer in the wireless communication device correspond to each of the connections and wherein the first timer is set to expire after the second timer.

However, Madour II teaches "wherein a first timer in the PDSN and a second timer in the wireless communication device correspond to each of the connections and wherein the first timer is set to expire after the second timer (see col. 3, lines 37-54 and col. 6, lines 27-50).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Madour II with the system of Bertrand for the benefit of achieving a system that includes hash function of system selection (see col. 4, lines 60-65).

Regarding **claim 9,** as recited in claim 7, Bertrand discloses the Packet Data Serving Node (PDSN), wherein an active connection identifier is stored in the connection table

to identify zero or one active connection for each wireless communication device (see col. 6, lines 43-64).

Regarding **claim 10,** as recited in claim 9, Bertrand discloses the Packet Data Serving Node (PDSN), wherein the processor selects all of the connections associated with a wireless communication device for transmission to the wireless communication device when no connection for the wireless communication device is identified as active (= creation of new session, see col. 6, lines 43-64).

Regarding **claim 11,** as recited in claim 9, Bertrand discloses the Packet Data Serving Node (PDSN), wherein the processor selects a subset of the connections associated with a wireless communication device for transmission to the wireless communication device when no connection for the wireless communication device is identified as active (see col. 6, lines 43-64).

Regarding **claim 12,** as recited in claim 9, Bertrand discloses the Packet Data Serving Node (PDSN), wherein the processor selects the most recent active connection from the connections associated with a wireless communication device for transmission to the wireless communication device when no connection for the wireless communication device is identified as active (= previous PPP context are used, see col. 7, lines 1-19).

Regarding **claim 13,** as recited in claim 9, Bertrand discloses the Packet Data Serving Node (PDSN), wherein the processor selects one or more connections randomly from the connections associated with a wireless communication device for transmission to the wireless communication device when no connection for the wireless communication device is identified as active (see col. 7, line 57- col. 8, lines 34).

Regarding **claim 14,** as recited in claim 7, Bertrand discloses the Packet Data Serving Node (PDSN), further comprising a plurality of timers corresponding to the plurality of stored connections, wherein the processor removes a connection from the connection table upon expiration of one of the plurality of timers associated with the connection (col. 7, lines 32-56).

Regarding **claim 15,** as recited in claim 14, Bertrand discloses the Packet Data Serving Node (PDSN), wherein the processor resets one of the plurality of timers in response to an activity indicator associated with the mobile station on the corresponding connection (see col. 6, lines 43- 64).

Regarding **claim 25,** as recited in claim 23, Bertrand fails to disclose "maintaining a plurality of timers corresponding to the plurality of stored connections and removing a connection from the connection table upon expiration of one of the plurality of timers associated with the connection" (col. 7, lines 32-56).

However, Madour II teaches "maintaining a plurality of timers corresponding to the plurality of stored connections and removing a connection from the connection table upon expiration of one of the plurality of timers associated with the connection" (see col. 3, lines 37-54 and col. 6, lines 27-50).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Madour II with the system of Bertrand for the benefit of achieving a system that includes hash function of system selection (see col. 4, lines 60-65).

CONCLUSION

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner. SEE MPEP 2141.02 [R-5] VI. PRIOR ART MUST BE CONSIDERED IN ITS ENTIRETY, INCLUDING DISCLOSURES THAT TEACH AWAY FROM THE CLAIMS: A prior art reference must be considered in its entirety, i.e., as a whole, including portions that would lead away from the claimed invention. W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert.

denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984) In re Fulton, 391 F.3d 1195, 1201, 73 USPQ2d 1141, 1146 (Fed. Cir. 2004). >See also MPEP §2123.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of 33the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kwasi Karikari whose telephone number is 571-272-8566. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T (9am - 7pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Appiah can be reached on 571-272-7904. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8566. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kwasi Karikari
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2617
06/23/2008

/Charles N. Appiah/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617